Texas Department of Insurance
Division of Workers' Compensation
Medical Fee Dispute Resolution, MS-48
7551 Metro Center Drive, Suite 100 • Austin, Texas 78744-1645
518-804-4000 telephone • 512-804-4811 fax • www.tdi.texas.gov

MEDICAL FEE DISPUTE RESOLUTION FINDINGS AND DECISION

GENERAL INFORMATION

Requestor Name and Address

VISTA MEDICAL CENTER HOSPITAL
4301 VISTA ROAD
PASADENA, TEXAS 77504

Carrier's Austin Representative Box

45

Respondent Name

STATE OFFICE OF RISK MANAGEMENT

MFDR Date Received

MFDR Tracking Number

M4-05-4763-01

MARCH 2, 2005

REQUESTOR'S POSITION SUMMARY

Requestor's Position Summary Dated March 23, 2005: "Please find enclosed the request for Medical Dispute Resolution from Vista Medical Center Hospital. The Carrier denied payment with payment exception codes "F, G, and N" in regard to their reduction in payment. Further, the Carrier did not complete an on-site audit…

…The Carrier did not provide a proper explanation in conjunction with the "F, G and N" payment exception codes as required by the TWCC Rules and Commission instructions. Vista Medical Center Hospital was not provided with a sufficient explanation or the proper denial reasons in order to provide evidence to justify the disputed charges upon reconsideration. Therefore, the Carrier has made no legal denial of reimbursement under the applicable rules and statutes…"

Requestor's Supplemental Position Summary Dated October 28, 2011: "Please allow this letter to serve as a supplemental statement to Vista's originally submitted request for dispute resolution in consideration of the Texas Third Court of Appeal's Final Judgment…"

Amount in Dispute (taken from the table of disputed services): $63,821.29

RESPONDENT'S POSITION SUMMARY

Respondent's Position Summary Dated April 5, 2005: "…the Office found that the requestor has failed to provide evidence that the admission required unusually extensive services that are more extensive and costly than usually required by a patient with that diagnosis, treatment and length of stay.…"

Response Submitted by: State Office of Risk Management

Respondent's Supplemental Position Summary Dated November 2, 2011: "…the Office respectfully objects to the Division allowing the amended position statements to be utilized in determining a decision for medical fee dispute resolution. The Office has reviewed the date of the amended position statement and determined the document was **not** timely submitted by the requestor pursuant to Rule 133.307(g)(3)(D)(F)…"

Response Submitted by: State Office of Risk Management

SUMMARY OF FINDINGS

Disputed Dates	Disputed Services	Amount In Dispute	Amount Due
March 13, 2004 through March 17, 2004	Inpatient Hospital Services	$63,821.29	$7,436.82

FINDINGS AND DECISION

This medical fee dispute is decided pursuant to Texas Labor Code §413.031 and all applicable, adopted rules of the Texas Department of Insurance, Division of Workers' Compensation.

Background

1. 28 Texas Administrative Code §133.304, 17 *Texas Register* 1105, effective February 20, 1992, amended effective July 15, 2000 sets out the procedures for medical payments and denials
2. 28 Texas Administrative Code §133.305 and §133.307, 27 *Texas Register* 12282, applicable to requests filed on or after January 1, 2003, sets out the procedures for resolving medical fee disputes.
3. 28 Texas Administrative Code §134.401, 22 *Texas Register* 6264, effective August 1, 1997, sets out the fee guidelines for inpatient services rendered in an acute care hospital.
4. 28 Texas Administrative Code §134.1, 27 *Texas Register* 4047, effective May 16, 2002, sets out the guidelines for a fair and reasonable amount of reimbursement in the absence of a contract or an applicable division fee guideline.

The services in dispute were reduced/denied by the respondent with the following reason codes:

Explanation of Benefits

EOB dated 06/08/04

- F – Fee guideline MAR reduction
  Reduction according to Acute Care Inpatient Hospital Fee Guideline. (Prospective Payment System/Per Diem.)
- N – Not appropriate documented
  Upon review, documentation as submitted does not support the level or service(s) billed.
- N – Not appropriate documented
  Upon review, documentation as submitted does not support the medical necessity of this service.
- N – Not appropriate documented
  Documentation does not adequately identified/quantified services or supplies billed.

EOB dated 06/24/04

- O – Denial after reconsideration
  Upon review of your request for reconsideration, no additional benefit is recommend.
- F – Fee guideline MAR reduction
  Reduction according to Acute Care Inpatient Hospital Fee Guideline. (Prospective Payment System/Per Diem.)
- N – Not appropriate documented
  Upon review, documentation as submitted does not support the medical necessity of this service.
- G – Unbundling (included in global)
  The value of this services is included in the value of another service billed on the same date.

Issues

1. Did the respondent provide sufficient explanation for denial of the disputed services?
2. Did the audited charges exceed $40,000.00?
3. Did the admission in dispute involve unusually extensive services?
4. Did the admission in dispute involve unusually costly services?
5. Does a medical necessity issue exist?
6. Is the requestor entitled to additional reimbursement?

Findings

This dispute relates to inpatient surgical services provided in a hospital setting with reimbursement subject to the provisions of Division rule at 28 Texas Administrative Code §134.401, titled *Acute Care Inpatient Hospital Fee Guideline*, effective August 1, 1997, 22 Texas Register 6264. The Third Court of Appeals' November 13, 2008 opinion in *Texas Mutual Insurance Company v. Vista Community Medical Center, LLP*, 275 *South Western Reporter Third* 538, 550 (Texas Appeals – Austin 2008, petition denied) addressed a challenge to the interpretation of 28 Texas Administrative Code §134.401. The Court concluded that "to be eligible for reimbursement under the Stop-Loss Exception, a hospital must demonstrate that the total audited charges exceed $40,000 and that an admission involved unusually costly and unusually extensive services." Both the requestor and respondent in this case were notified via form letter that the mandate for the decision cited above was issued on January 19, 2011. Each was given the opportunity to supplement their original MDR submission, position or response as applicable. The division received supplemental information as noted in the position summaries above. The supplemental information was shared among the parties as appropriate. The documentation filed by the requestor and respondent to date will be considered in determining whether the admission in dispute is eligible for reimbursement under the stop-loss method of payment. Consistent with the Third Court of Appeals' November 13, 2008 opinion, the division will address whether the total audited charges ***in this case*** exceed $40,000; whether the admission and disputed services ***in this case*** are unusually extensive; and whether the admission and disputed services ***in this case*** are unusually costly. 28 Texas Administrative Code §134.401(c)(2)(C) states, in pertinent part, that "Independent reimbursement is allowed on a case-by-case basis if the particular case exceeds the stop-loss threshold as described in paragraph (6) of this subsection…" 28 Texas Administrative Code §134.401(c)(6) puts forth the requirements to meet the three factors that will be discussed.

1. The requestor in its position statement asserts that "…Carrier did not provide a proper explanation in conjunction with the "F, G and N" payment exception codes as required by the TWCC Rules and Commission instructions. Vista Medical Center Hospital was not provided with a sufficient explanation or the proper denial reasons in order to provide evidence to justify the disputed charges upon reconsideration. Therefore, the Carrier has made no legal denial of reimbursement under the applicable rules and statutes..." 28 Texas Administrative Code §133.304(c), 17 Texas Register 1105, effective February 20, 1992, applicable to dates of service in dispute, states, in pertinent part, that "At the time an insurance carrier makes payment or denies payment on a medical bill, the insurance carrier shall send, in the form and manner prescribed by the Commission, the explanation of benefits to the appropriate parties. The explanation of benefits shall include the correct payment exception codes required by the Commission's instructions, and shall provide sufficient explanation to allow the sender to understand the reason(s) for the insurance carrier's action(s). A generic statement that simply states a conclusion such as 'not sufficiently documented' or other similar phrases with no further description of the reason for the reduction or denial of payment does not satisfy the requirements of this section." Review of the submitted documentation finds that the explanation of benefits were issued using the division-approved form TWCC 62 and noted payment exception codes "O, F, N and G".

   These payment exception codes and descriptions support an explanation for the reduction of reimbursement based on former 28 Texas Administrative Code §134.401. These reasons support a reduction of the reimbursement amount from the requested stop-loss exception payment reimbursement methodology to the standard per diem methodology amount and provided sufficient explanation to allow the provider to understand the reason(s) for the insurance carrier's action(s). The Division therefore concludes that the insurance carrier has substantially met the requirements of 28 Texas Administrative Code §133.304(c).

2. 28 Texas Administrative Code §134.401(c)(6)(A)(i) states "…to be eligible for stop-loss payment the total audited charges for a hospital admission must exceed $40,000, the minimum stop-loss threshold." Furthermore, (A) (v) of that same section states "…Audited charges are those charges which remain after a bill review by the insurance carrier has been performed…" Review of the explanation of benefits issued by the carrier finds that the carrier did not deduct any charges in accordance with §134.401(c)(6)(A)(v); therefore the audited charges equal $90,377.29. The Division concludes that the total audited charges exceed $40,000.

3. The requestor in its original position statement asserts that "…TWCC Rule 134.401 provides the rules regarding reimbursement for Acute Care In-patient Hospital Fee services. Specifically, reimbursement consists of 75% of remaining charges for the entire admission, after a Carrier audits a bill. See Tex. Admin. Code Section 133.401(c). This figure is presumptively considered to be "fair and reasonable" in accordance with the preamble of TWCC Rule 134. See 22 TexReg 6265. Further, the TWCC stated that the stop-loss threshold increases hospital reimbursement and will ensure fair and reasonable rates for hospitals and ensure access to quality health care for injured workers…" As noted above, the Third Court of Appeals' November 13, 2008 opinion in *Texas Mutual Insurance Company v. Vista Community Medical Center, LLP*, 275 *South*

Western Reporter Third 538, 550 (Texas Appeals – Austin 2008, petition denied) rendered judgment to the contrary. In its supplemental position statement, the requestor considered the Courts' final judgment and opined on both rule requirements. In regards to whether the services were unusually extensive, the Third Court of Appeals' November 13, 2008 opinion concluded that in order to be eligible for reimbursement under the stop-loss exception, a hospital must demonstrate that an admission involved unusually extensive services. Rule §134.401(c)(2)(C) allows for payment under the stop-loss exception on a case-by-case basis only if the particular case exceeds the stop-loss threshold as described in paragraph (6). Paragraph (6)(A)(ii) states that "This stop-loss threshold is established to ensure compensation for unusually extensive services required during an admission." The requestor's supplemental position statement asserts that:

> "The medical records on file with MDR show this admission to be a complex spine surgery which is unusually extensive for at least three reasons; first, this type of surgery is unusually extensive when compared to all surgeries performed on workers' compensation patients in that only 19% of such surgeries involved operations on the spine; second, this type of surgery requires additional, trained nursing staff and specialized equipment (such as the operating table) thereby making the hospital services unusually extensive; and third, the median length of stay ("LOS") for workers' compensation inpatient admissions is three days whereas the length of stay for this admission exceeds the median LOS. Finally, any evidence of comorbidities, which should be considered, is part of the medical records, which have been previously filed."

The requestor's categorization of spinal surgeries presupposes that all spinal surgeries are unusually extensive for the specified reasons. The requestor did not submit documentation to support the reasons asserted, nor did the requestor point to any sources for the information presented. The reasons stated are therefore not demonstrated. Additionally, the requestor's position that all spinal surgeries are unusually extensive does not satisfy §134.401(c)(2)(C) which requires application of the stop-loss exception on a case-by-case basis. The Third Court of Appeals' November 13, 2008 opinion affirmed this, stating "The rule further states that independent reimbursement under the Stop-Loss Exception will be 'allowed on a case-by-case basis.' *Id.* §134.401(c)(2)(C). This language suggests that the Stop-Loss Exception was meant to apply on a case-by-case basis in relatively few cases." The requestor's position that all spine surgeries are unusually extensive fails to meet the requirements of §134.401(c)(2)(C) because the particulars of the services in dispute are not discussed, nor does the requestor demonstrate how the services in dispute were unusually extensive in relation to similar spinal surgery services or admissions. For the reasons stated, the division finds that the requestor failed to demonstrate that the services in dispute were unusually extensive.

4. In regards to whether the services were unusually costly, the Third Court of Appeals' November 13, 2008 opinion concluded that in order to be eligible for reimbursement under the stop-loss exception, a hospital must demonstrate that an admission involved unusually costly services. 28 Texas Administrative Code §134.401(c)(6) states that "Stop-loss is an independent reimbursement methodology established to ensure fair and reasonable compensation to the hospital for unusually costly services rendered during treatment to an injured worker." The requestor's supplemental position statement asserts that:

   > "The medical and billing records on file with MDR also show that this admission was unusually costly for two reasons: first the median charge for all workers' compensation inpatient surgeries is $23,187; the median charge for workers' compensation surgeries of this type is $39,000; therefore, the audited billed charges for this surgery substantially exceed not only the median charges, but also the $40,000 stop-loss threshold; second, as mentioned in the preceding paragraph, in order for this surgery to be performed, specialized equipment and specially trained, extra nursing staff were required, thereby adding substantially to the cost of the surgery in comparison to other types of surgeries; and third, it was necessary to purchase expensive implants for use in the surgery."

   The requestor asserts that because the ***billed charges*** exceed the stop-loss threshold, the admission in this case is unusually costly. The Division notes that audited charges are addressed as a separate and distinct factor described in 28 Texas Administrative Code §134.401(c)(6)(A)(i). Billed charges for services do not represent the cost of providing those services, and no such relation has been established in the instant case. The requestor fails to demonstrate that the ***costs*** associated with the services in dispute are unusual when compared to similar spinal surgery services or admissions. For that reason, the division rejects the requestor's position that the admission is unusually costly based on the mere fact that the billed or audited charges "substantially" exceed $40,000. The requestor additionally asserts that certain resources that are used for the types of surgeries associated with the admission in dispute (i.e. specialized equipment and specially-trained, extra nursing staff) added substantially to the cost of the admission. The requestor does not list or quantify the costs associated with these resources in relation to the disputed services, nor does the requestor provide documentation to support a reasonable comparison between the resources required for both types of surgeries. Therefore, the requestor fails to demonstrate that the resources used in this particular admission are unusually costly when compared to resources used in other types of surgeries.

5. According to the explanation of benefits, the respondent denied reimbursement for the intensive care unit (ICU) surgical services based upon "N12-Not appropriate documented. Upon review, documentation as submitted does not support the medical necessity of this service." In the "Comments" section of the EOB, the respondent wrote "ICU STAY, TOBRAMYACIN, & MORPHINE NEED DOCUMENTATION. IMPLANTS LISTED ON UB ARE INCONSISTENT WITH ITEMIZED NEED FURTHER DOCUMENTATION FOR CLARIFICATION. PCA PUMP UNDER INCORRECT REV CODE." A review of the Discharge Summary report finds "Unfortunately, on 3/16/04 the patient developed supraventricular tachycardia. He was administered Adenosine and had converted back to sinus tachycardia. He was then evaluated by a cardiologist who determined that the patient was then doing well so the patient was discharged from the Intensive Care Unit on 3/17/04 to home." Therefore, the documentation supports the transfer from the surgical care to the ICU care. Furthermore, the respondent did not maintain the denial as noted on the Table of Disputed Services "The Office will maintain the requestor has failed to meet the requirements for the stop loss method." Therefore, the disputed services will be reviewed per applicable Division rules and guidelines.
6. For the reasons stated above the services in dispute are not eligible for the stop-loss method of reimbursement. Consequently, reimbursement shall be calculated pursuant to 28 Texas Administrative Code §134.401(c)(1) titled *Standard Per Diem Amount* and §134.401(c)(4) titled *Additional Reimbursements.* The Division notes that additional reimbursements under §134.401(c)(4) apply only to bills that do not reach the stop-loss threshold described in subsection (c)(6) of this section.

- Review of the submitted documentation finds that the services provided were surgical and ICU; therefore the standard per diem amount of $1,118.00 and $1,560.00 per day applies. Division rule at 28 Texas Administrative Code §134.401(c)(3)(ii) states, in pertinent part, that "The applicable Workers' Compensation Standard Per Diem Amount (SPDA) is multiplied by the length of stay (LOS) for admission…" The length of stay was four days. The surgical per diem rate of $1,118.00 multiplied by the length of stay of three days of $3,354.00 added to the $1,560.00 per diem rate multiplied by one day results in an allowable amount of $4,914.00.
- 28 Texas Administrative Code §134.401(c)(4)(A), states "When medically necessary the following services indicated by revenue codes shall be reimbursed at cost to the hospital plus 10%: (i) Implantables (revenue codes 275, 276, and 278), and (ii) Orthotics and prosthetics (revenue code 274)."
- A review of the submitted medical bill indicates that the requestor billed revenue code 278 for Implants at $33,006.00. The respondent paid $0.00.
- The Division finds the total allowable for the implants billed under revenue code 278 is:

Description of Implant per Itemized Statement	Quantity	Cost Invoice	Cost + 10%
Curciate Retaining	1	No support for cost/ invoice	$0.00
Bone Cement	2	No support for cost/ invoice	$0.00
Patella Howmedica	1	$725.00	$797.50
Tibial Tray	1	$1,754.00	$1929.40
Femoral Comp Howmedi	1	$2907.00	$3197.70
Pins (Howmedica)	1	$509.00	$559.90
TOTAL DUE	7		$6,484.50

- 28 Texas Administrative Code §134.401(c)(4)(C) states "Pharmaceuticals administered during the admission and greater than $250 charged per dose shall be reimbursed at cost to the hospital plus 10%. Dose is the amount of a drug or other substance to be administered at one time." A review of the submitted itemized statement finds that the requestor billed $425.00/unit for Morphine PCA and $1,708.55/unit for Tobramycin 1.2 GM POW.The requestor did not submit documentation to support what the cost to the hospital was for these items billed under revenue code 250. For that reason, additional reimbursement for these items cannot be recommended.

The division concludes that the total allowable for this admission is $11,398.50. The respondent issued payment in the amount of $3,961.68. Based upon the documentation submitted additional reimbursement in the amount of $7,436.82 is recommended.

Conclusion

The submitted documentation does not support the reimbursement amount sought by the requestor. The requestor in this case demonstrated that the audited charges exceed $40,000, but failed to demonstrate that the disputed inpatient hospital admission involved unusually extensive services, and failed to demonstrate that the services in dispute were unusually costly. Consequently, 28 Texas Administrative Code §134.401(c)(1) titled *Standard Per Diem Amount,* and §134.401(c)(4) titled *Additional Reimbursements* are applied and result in additional reimbursement.

ORDER

Based upon the documentation submitted by the parties and in accordance with the provisions of Texas Labor Code Sections 413.031 and 413.019 (if applicable), the division has determined that the requestor is entitled to additional reimbursement for the services involved in this dispute. The division hereby ORDERS the respondent to remit to the requestor the amount of $7,436.82 plus applicable accrued interest per 28 Texas Administrative Code §134.803, due within 30 days of receipt of this Order.

Authorized Signature

		8/14/2012
Signature	Medical Fee Dispute Resolution Officer	Date

YOUR RIGHT TO APPEAL

Either party to this medical fee dispute may appeal this decision by requesting a contested case hearing. A completed **Request for a Medical Contested Case Hearing** (form **DWC045A**) must be received by the DWC Chief Clerk of Proceedings within **twenty** days of your receipt of this decision. A request for hearing should be sent to: Chief Clerk of Proceedings, Texas Department of Insurance, Division of Workers Compensation, P.O. Box 17787, Austin, Texas, 78744. The party seeking review of the MDR decision shall deliver a copy of the request for a hearing to all other parties involved in the dispute at the same time the request is filed with the Division. **Please include a copy of the *Medical Fee Dispute Resolution Findings and Decision*** together with any other required information specified in 28 Texas Administrative Code §148.3(c), including a **certificate of service demonstrating that the request has been sent to the other party**.

Si prefiere hablar con una persona en español acerca de ésta correspondencia, favor de llamar a 512-804-4812.